

forth in the Action. All of the claims have been reviewed and numerous ones of the claims have been amended so as to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested respectfully in view of the amendment herein.

Claims 1 - 191 were said to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With respect to specific points raised by the Examiner, the following is noted.

In Claim 3, the dependency of Claim 3 has been changed from Claim 2 to Claim 1 so as to provide the proper reading of the claim.

In Claim 12, the term "network" has been added in Line 2 so as to provide a proper reading of the claim.

In Claim 24, a clause has been inserted at Line 5 to provide antecedent basis for the scoring criteria. Also, in Line 11, the term "network" has been corrected to read --communication--. Furthermore, in Line 12, the word "stations" has been rewritten in the singular so as to conform to the rest of the claim.

In Claim 32 at line 5, the term "program" has been made --programs-- so as to provide the appropriate antecedent basis. Also, with respect to the Examiner's observation that there is no structural cooperation between the claimed means for providing a response criteria and other elements of the claim, it is noted that the means for providing the response criteria is in the paragraph extending from lines 22 -24, and that the following paragraph extending from lines 25 - 29 provides for means employing the response criteria. This is believed to be an adequate cooperative relationship between the means for providing the response criteria and the evaluating means which employs the response criteria.

In Claim 93, the term "a central location" has been changed to --a storage location-- so as to provide conformance with the other claims.

In the amendment of the claims in the numerous locations, various terms have been altered slightly to provide for relatively small editorial corrections which include providing adequate antecedent basis and correction of any indefiniteness due to words such as "their", and "its", by way of example.

The foregoing amendment is believed to meet all the points raised by the Examiner so as to place the claims in condition for allowance. If any of the matters raised in the Action or any further matters have not been adequately resolved by this amendment, a telephone interview between Applicant's representative and the Examiner is requested in order to resolve any such outstanding matters.

It is submitted respectfully that all the claims are now in condition for allowance in that they clearly set forth the invention. Accordingly, a favorable action indicating such condition is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington
Mark F. Harrington, Reg. No. 31,686
Perman & Green
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430
(203) 259-1800

1/27/95
Date



66

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

1/27/95
Date

Jenia A. McElhill
Name of Person Making Deposit